DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 878 EC 143 143

AUTHOR Waldstein, Arnold, Ed.; Pelz, Ruth, Ed.
TITLE Developing Collaborative Relationships: A Key to Disseminating Early Childhood/Special Education Models.
INSTITUTION National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Washington, D.C.; Western States Technical Assistance Resource, Monmouth, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 82
CONTRACT 300-80-0753
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; *Information Dissemination; Intervention; Models; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *National Diffusion Network Programs

ABSTRACT

The booklet documents the activities of Special Education Programs (SEP) and the National Diffusion Network (NDN) to build cooperative efforts between the two agencies in disseminating effective models for early intervention with the handicapped. Part I explains the historical network of the subnetwork, details the formal agreements, and presents results of a conference to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the system and to develop cooperative/coordinative plans for the future. Six major areas for potential collaboration (training, technical assistance, resource banks, referral systems, evaluation, and awareness) are presented in tables which cover each area in terms of their definitions, potential benefits, and suggested activities. Part II presents state efforts and shows how collaborative networking worked for each of the five participating states: Colorado, Illinois, Maine, Ohio, and Washington. Appended are a list of conference participants and a memorandum of understanding drawn between the NDN and Divisions of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (now the Office of Special Education) concerning Joint Dissemination Review Panel Projects. (Author/SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218878

DEVELOPING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

A Key to Disseminating Early Childhood/Special Education Models

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth Dana

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by:

TADS
Technical Assistance Development System
A Division of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center
University of North Carolina
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

WESTAR
Western States Technical Assistance Resource
345 North Monmouth Avenue
Monmouth, Oregon 97361

SEP
Special Education Programs
OSERS
Sixth and D Street S.W.
Donohoe Building
Washington, D.C. 20202

SIG
State Implementation Grants, contact NASDSE
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
1201 610 E
Washington, D.C. 20036

EC143143

Editing:

Arnold Waldstein
Ruth Pelz

Word Processing:

Valerie Woods

Printed By:

Western States Technical Assistance Resource
Seattle, Washington

1982

Produced under contract number 300-80-0753 from Special Education Services, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

CONTENTS

Foreword		
Part I	The Collaborative Approach	1
Part II	The Five Pilot Efforts	9
	Colorado	10
	Illinois	12
	Maine	14
	Ohio	16
	Washington	18
Appendix A	Memorandum of Understanding	21
Appendix B	Participants List	25

FOREWORD

Early childhood education for handicapped children is a relatively recent advancement in American education. Where effective programs have been developed, they are yielding evidence that early intervention can play a critical role in enhancing the lifelong achievement of handicapped individuals. A number of proven educational models now exist, and there are various mechanisms for disseminating these models, including outreach projects, the National Diffusion Network and consortia. However, despite these mechanisms and despite evidence of model program success, the rate of program replication has not been as high as might be possible.

In an effort to amend this situation, the National Diffusion Network (NDN) and Special Education Programs (SEP) began work in 1978 to build cooperative efforts between the two agencies. The goal of the cooperative efforts would be to establish a national subnetwork within the NDN. This booklet documents the efforts of SEP and NDN to develop the subnetwork, tracing the history of the collaborative effort from the initial 1979 Memorandum of Understanding through to the May, 1981 Conference where the efforts were evaluated and finalized.

This document is organized in two sections. Part I explains the historical background of the subnetwork, details the formal agreements and presents the results of the 1981 Conference. Part II presents individual state efforts and shows how collaborative networking worked for each of the five participating states.

The collaborative network was the effort of a number of organizations and individuals. Special acknowledgment for this booklet goes to state representatives who provided descriptions of their state efforts, Jerry Dominguez of WESTAR, Mike Norman of NASDSE, Pat Trohanis and Mike Woodard of TADS and William Swan and Gary Lambour of U.S. Special Education Programs.

PART I

THE COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

Special Education Programs (SEP) and the National Diffusion Network (NDN) signed the first formal Memorandum of Understanding on October 1, 1979. However, planning for the subnetwork began in 1978 when two agencies analyzed the situation and made tentative suppositions about the ways to increase expected replication rates for educational programs.

Key factors for the rate of program replication seemed to be the distribution of information on model programs and practices, and that practitioners and administrators needed sufficient information, experience, or knowledge of how to obtain resources. It was hoped that the cooperative effort between the two agencies would link previously separate elements of the dissemination system--Education Agencies [via State Implementation Grants (SIGs)] and NDN state facilitators--to encourage better communication, joint planning and implementation of dissemination efforts and that this would, in turn, help maximize the use of Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) approved models for special education.

It was agreed that such a subnetwork would be based on the following principles and assumptions:

- By coordinating local, state and federal efforts, the number of high quality special education programs could be increased.
- Local and state levels would have the main responsibility for carrying out new policies while the role of the federal government in such coordination would be supportive.
- While there may be significant differences among members of the groups involved, there are more similarities among the groups than differences.
- The establishment of a coordinating subnetwork is a complex, major undertaking.
- An overall plan should be developed, which would outline the steps to be taken and the evaluation process to be used.
- People become involved in the subnetwork through active participation and leadership, not through passive watching and reading.
- A pilot effort should be implemented and analyzed before creating a full subnetwork across all special projects.

The 1979 Memorandum of Understanding between SEP and NDN (see Appendix A) formalized these general principal assumptions into two major objectives:

- To develop pilot coordination efforts in five states among the State Facilitators (SF's), and Developer/Demonstrators (D/D's) of the NDN and the State Implementation Grant Directors of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) in order to provide examples of effective cooperation/coordination at the state and local level which are consistent with the memorandum.
- To develop a coordination plan as soon as was reasonable which focused on all the special education D/D's.

As a result of the October, 1979 Memorandum of Understanding, pilot cooperation efforts were initiated in Colorado, Illinois, Maine, Ohio and Washington under the joint direction of the State Implementation Grant Directors and the state facilitators. Written reports of the collaborative efforts in each of these states are included in Part II of this document.

All groups involved indicated that the pilot efforts were effective in increasing the use of JDRP approved model programs in their states, and thus in improving the services to handicapped children and their families. Participants also agreed that the relationships established through the pilot efforts were productive. Evaluations of the pilot projects were initially formalized at six month intervals and resulted in the continuation of the Memorandum of Understanding, signed on April 17, 1980. As of March, 1982 the collaborative effort is still functioning as a formal subnetwork.

The 1981 Conference

In order to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the system and of cooperative/coordinative efforts and to develop plans for the future, a conference was held in May, 1981, in cooperation with Handicapped Children's Education Program (HCEEP) technical assistance centers; the Technical Assistance Development System (TADS) and the Western States Technical Assistance Resource (WESTAR). State Directors of Special Education, Developer/Demonstrator (D/DS) representatives, state facilitators, NDN representatives, SEP staff and TADS and WESTAR staff, were invited to attend. A complete listing of workshop participants can be found in Appendix B.

This conference considered questions such as whether the cooperative efforts should be continued and, if so, in what directions; what expansion should take place based on the results to date; and

what should be the timing of such an expansion. The conference had two specific purposes:

- To prepare a short booklet with the ideas and strategies for local and state education agencies (with or without State Implementation Grants) to use in initiating and maintaining a collaborative relationship with State Early Childhood/Special Education (EC/SE) consultants and D/D's to provide for stimulating or maintaining high quality services for young handicapped children.
- To allow the exchange of information among states, NDN, state facilitators, SIGs, SEP and the two technical assistance agencies.

Conference participants analyzed the need for planning and the criteria for a successful planning process.* They developed a number of general statements on the need for and the efficacy of planning for collaborative relationships. Conference participants agreed that whatever the areas of collaboration or the specific activities to be implemented, it is important to begin statewide efforts with a plan. In addition to creating a clear public focus, the planning process creates feelings of ownership--and thus of involvement--for participants. These participants can use the plan, in turn, to mobilize further administrative and public support. Planning helps prioritize concerns and allocate resources more efficiently.

For a planning process to be effective, several essential factors must be taken into consideration. All of those who are principally responsible for early childhood/special education programs should be involved, including State Directors of Special Education, State Implementation Grant Directors, Early Childhood/Special Education Coordinators, HCEEP Demonstration Projects, State Facilitators of the NDN, Developer/Demonstrator Projects in Early Childhood Special Education, local education agency personnel and other interested groups. Local education agency personnel are particularly important, for if innovation is to take place, then the cardinal principle must be: THE USER IS THE STARTING PLACE. Since local education agencies, other agencies and schools are the users, consumers and adopters of promising practices, they must be involved in all phases of planning.

Planning should be a collaborative process with a precisely defined sequence of steps resulting in a description of the functions, linkages and order of tasks that comprise effective dissemination.

*For a step-by-step approach to the planning process, refer to A Framework for Statewide Planning, prepared by TADS, WESTAR, SEP and SIGs in January 1982.

Although the planning processes should be exacting and individualized, some general guidelines are applicable to all plans. The following general guidelines were developed by conference participants.

1. Develop a mutual definition of "collaboration."
2. Use relevant and timely data for decision-making.
3. Encourage information exchange.
4. Pay attention to the need for closure on issues and decisions.
5. Make a clear and realistic division of labor.
6. Define member and manager roles.
7. Use individual styles and talents as mutual resources.
8. Structure participation to insure that each member has a feeling of control.
9. Encourage a multilevel communication system.
10. Identify all resources and use them to the fullest.
11. Allow time for participants to reflect on the quality of their efforts.
12. Deal with issues of turf. (Who owns what? Who can do what for whom?)
13. Provide opportunities for participant growth and development.
14. Attend to mutual recognition of participants' contributions and achievements.
15. Streamline overall efforts by identifying and eliminating duplicate efforts among agencies where they are not warranted.
16. Keep the group's tasks goal-oriented and concrete.
17. Provide for continuous and expanding networking among participants themselves, and between them and their own constituents and consumers.
18. Clarify the relationship between individual integrity and group responsibility in a collaborative effort.
19. Examine different levels and kinds of collaboration within the group (e.g., personal, social, political, economic).
20. Envision collaboration as socialized creativity.

However, it is important to be reasonable about what each participant in a collaborative planning effort can contribute. For example, the conference participants all have acknowledged a commitment to intensive collaborative efforts. At the same time, each is also involved in a continuum of activities, of which the dissemination of early childhood models is only one part. Therefore, it is necessary to view collaboration as the productive intersecting of these agencies and projects at this point of mutual concern and commitment. None of the parties involved is in a position to devote all of his or her time and resources to this effort. A first step in collaboration would, therefore, be a mutual determination, understanding, and some commitment of each party's time and resources, in relation to the responsibility that each bears for early

childhood special education. This is not to say that each contribution must be measurably equal; it is to say that all parties need to be willing to extend themselves sufficiently to organize a genuine and goal-oriented collaboration.

As a summary statement, conference participants identified six major areas for potential collaboration: Training, Technical Assistance, Resource Banks, Referral Systems, Evaluation, and Awareness. These areas were not considered as interdependent or as having prerequisities. Rather, they were thought of as an array of activities, any of which would lead toward the establishment of a statewide dissemination system. Three aspects of each area were discussed: their definitions, potential benefits and suggested activities. These are summarized in the following tables.

TABLE I
TRAINING

DEFINITION	POTENTIAL BENEFITS
Transferring knowledge and/or skills (in this case, specific to the development and implementation of early childhood programs).	Increased utilization of knowledge or skills.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

- Make training in dissemination and collaborative activity part of in-service and preservice training of educational personnel.
- Provide consumer information and training in assessing local needs and contexts and in selecting promising practices and products that will match local conditions.
- Train users in adapting improvements in the schools.
- Train users in developing policies, regulations and procedures which foster the continuation of improvements.
- Train users in selecting, socializing and preparing staff to carry out a change program over time.
- Train users in gaining the types of support from organizational leadership and the community necessary to continue the innovation.
- Provide educators with new competencies (as required by new practices) through some form of continuing education.
- Provide locally tailored training and on-site consultation to local practitioners.
- Develop cooperative program with universities.

TABLE 2
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

DEFINITION	POTENTIAL BENEFITS
Securing appropriate resources to meet specific client needs in the areas of initiating, planning and implementing early childhood handicapped programs.	Increased access to the technical resources necessary to implement model programs by program planners and developers.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

- Identify a cadre of individuals in the state to provide technical assistance.
- Train individuals to provide technical assistance.
- Develop and implement a needs assessment instrument.
- Develop a resource bank of information.
- Develop a "broker system" to match resources and needs.

TABLE 3
RESOURCE BANKS

DEFINITION	POTENTIAL BENEFITS
Maintaining a collection of information on early childhood handicapped programs.	Increased access to information.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

- Identify types of information that should be contained in the resource bank.
- Identify existing sources of information.
- Identify "missing" information.
- Design system of entry of material and access for users.
- Develop "update" procedures.
- Create awareness of the system.

TABLE 4
REFERRAL SYSTEMS

DEFINITION	POTENTIAL BENEFITS
Establishing a system for matching needs with resources and information for programming.	Assurance of appropriate information and resources to users.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

- Identify local, state, regional and national resources.
- Extend consumer awareness of resources at various levels.
- Use needs assessment information and data on frequency of requests to make the match between available referral sources and client requests for information.
- Assist local districts in identifying their own successful practices, natural linkers and sources of collegiality and internal self-referral.
- Secure commitments from referral sources as to what they can and will deliver.
- Develop a system for retrieving and disseminating resources.
- Train staff who work with early childhood providers in the referral process.

TABLE 5
EVALUATION

DEFINITION	POTENTIAL BENEFITS
Establishing a continual process to identify strengths and weaknesses of all areas of the dissemination system.	Allowance for continual modification of the system to increase its effectiveness for users.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

- Identify areas and criteria for success.
- Develop surveys and questionnaires for users.
- Develop a system which assures use of the evaluation data in the decision-making process.

TABLE 6
AWARENESS

DEFINITION	POTENTIAL BENEFITS
Providing potential users with relevant information regarding the existence of early childhood model programs and other information and materials available for program development.	Increased knowledge on the part of potential users of existing early childhood handicapped models and how to access these models.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

- Provide information on replicable practices and models through brochures and packets in formats, styles and languages suitable to all clients.
- Provide information on specific products that may be useful to specific clients.
- Provide comparative information on different practices and products.
- Facilitate the demonstration of products and practices.
- Promote and advertise products, services and practices.
- Make the public aware of educational programs that work and other success stories taking place in the public schools; develop speakers' bureaus and use local newspapers and television.
- Use conferences and other group sessions to identify what participants are "buying" (what they seek) and "selling" (what they can share), and then provide copies of this information in resource exchange booklets.
- Use new media and communication technology to increase the cost-effectiveness of extension activities during the awareness, interest and pretrial evaluation phases of the adoption process. Audio and video cassettes, filmstrips, film cartridges and local broadcasting facilities can be used.

PART II

THE FIVE PILOT EFFORTS

Part II of this document includes descriptions of the five participating states' efforts at developing collaborative relationships.

By examining the state plans, it will become evident how each state made use of general guidelines for collaborative planning and adapted them for its own uses, in accordance with its needs. The plans should be viewed as experimental efforts and as a tangible manifestation of the collaborative goals initiated with the 1979 Memorandum of Understanding. For further information on an individual state's plan or effort, contact the state representative.

COLORADO

Statewide collaborative efforts in Colorado were initiated by a statewide awareness conference sponsored by the State Implementation Grant, in cooperation with the State Facilitator Project of NDN. A variety of JDRP approved projects and state Preschool Incentive projects were also involved.

The first conference, which was attended by over 100 people, resulted in numerous requests for follow-up and adoptions. In addition, a conference publication which described each project was distributed to over 200 additional people.

The next major undertaking was to involve the JDRP approved projects with the State's Preschool Incentive projects on a three-year cycle, similar to that of the HCEEP demonstration projects. Local sites have been offered three funding options:

Option A:

Districts or administrative units which currently have a preschool special education project have the opportunity to become an adoption site for one of the JDRP approved Early Childhood projects. Preschool Incentive Grant funds will be used when necessary to supplement training funds provided by the NDN. Funds will be used to assist in the adoptions, (e.g., training materials, travel, etc.) but will not be used to fund local project staff.

Option B:

Districts or administration units that do not have preschool special education programs, or that wish to expand services to this population by providing a new program, have the opportunity to apply for Preschool Incentive Grant funds. These funds would support a staff person, including salary, fringe benefits, travel, materials and training. The funds can only be used to start a new program or expand existing services and cannot supplant any existing services.

Option C:

This option is a combination of A and B above. Districts or administrative units that do not have a preschool special education program or that wish to expand their service can apply for Preschool Incentive Grant funds to fund the program (as outlined in B above) and to become an adoption site (as outlined in A above). Funds would be available to support a staff person and to supplement existing funds.

It is anticipated that in addition to the new sites funded under the Preschool Incentive Grants, other sites will also require training. Following a needs assessment this fall, there are plans to use the validated projects to provide statewide training in specific disability areas.

Overall, the cooperative efforts undertaken, both nationally and within the state, have proven to be extremely beneficial in terms of upgrading the quality of services to young handicapped children and their families. They have also been cost-efficient and have resulted in broadening the channels of communication between local service providers, state staff, JDRP approved projects and the federal offices.

Prior to the 1981 national meeting, projects made their own contacts with local sites, with little, if any, contact with the state. Now the projects are in close communication with the state staff. This can, and has, assisted both the state and the projects by providing additional needed information regarding identified or potential sites. It also provides the state staff with an opportunity to meet and become more familiar with the projects, their goals and resources. This can facilitate both the location of additional sites and future training endeavors undertaken by the state. As the state becomes aware of new training needs, it can draw upon appropriate projects for assistance.

For more information, contact:

Brian McNulty
Early Childhood Consultant
Colorado Department of Education
CHILEP
201 East Colfax
Denver, CO 80203
303/839-2727

ILLINOIS

Collaborative activities in Illinois were initiated by the Department of Specialized Educational Services (SES) of the Illinois State Board of Education and have involved the Statewide Facilitator Center, SES, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the National Diffusion Network, and the Developer/Demonstrators.

The first interaction occurred almost accidentally, when, in 1979, the Department of Specialized Services contracted for writing and publishing of A Guide to Model Programs in Early Childhood Education for the Handicapped. The writer identified the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program and the National Diffusion Network as resources, among others. When the guide was published, the Department realized that technical assistance staff in the field should receive training in order to know more about these programs and to respond to requests about them. The Statewide Facilitator Center and the SES agreed to participate in this information sharing.

From that point on, with added support from the agreement between the NDN and SES, the Illinois State Board of Education and the Statewide Facilitator Center have worked more collaboratively than before. Because the grantee of the Statewide Facilitator Center is not the State Education Agency and because of geographic distances, personal contacts are infrequent unless a specific project is under way. However, information sharing through the mails is ongoing and keeps both departments informed of relevant interests.

With the encouragement and support of the federal agreement and the support generated from a meeting in Chicago in 1980, the education specialist for Early Childhood Special Education and a representative of the Statewide Facilitator Center determined a training need in the awareness area for client groups in Illinois who might not be aware of high caliber early childhood programs available for adoption.

Permission was given to pursue plans for a conference, utilizing Preschool Incentive funds to help defray costs. The Illinois Department of Children and Family Services became involved, for the first time on this topic, by identifying potential clients. The conference was planned through the fall of 1980 and was presented to a relatively small audience in March, 1981. One adoption is currently assured.

The primary benefits to date include: improved awareness and communication between the two agencies, initial stages of identifying mutual needs and initial planning of strategies to meet the mutual needs.

Future directions include evaluating how well the awareness training met the needs of those involved, determining what current and future needs exist, determining what strategies should be employed to meet these newly identified needs, and identifying the resources and the time needed for continued collaboration.

For more information, contact:

Julie Carter
Early Childhood Consultant
Department of Specialized Educational Services
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777
217/782-5601

MAINE

The collaboration process between the State's Division of Special Education and the Maine Facilitator Center was begun early in February, 1980. Two issues were identified. The first was how to increase awareness--both general awareness of the need for early childhood special education and school district awareness of the variety of model programs already in existence. The second issue was how the agencies could effectively encourage more public schools to become involved in providing early childhood special education programs within their districts--in a state which has neither mandatory nor permissive preschool handicapped legislation.

While the Division of Special Education took the lead by arranging the original meeting, the collaboration was (and continues to be) a shared effort. The Division and the Commissioner of Education's office made time and some resources available for the Early Childhood Consultant to participate in this effort. The Facilitator Center made substantial staff time available and lent its support to the concept.

Federal support included arranging for shared meetings with other states pursuing similar collaborative efforts, allowing the Division to use some of its State Implementation Grant funds to support the activities planned, and awarding a supplemental grant to the Facilitator Center to enable them to assist in the effort. Other support came from three local education agencies which freed their staff to participate in the planning process.

The approach chosen had three steps: 1) Survey all school districts in the state for their level of interest in preschool handicapped services, 2) Assess district needs and determine what types of programs for which kinds of children would best meet their needs, and 3) Arrange an awareness conference built around model programs best fitting those needs. A planning committee was established representing the Facilitator Center, the Division of Special Education, several local school districts, two preschool coordination programs and representatives of possible funding sources within the Department of Education. The committee met five times over the course of several months, developing the two-step survey process outlined above and then designing a conference format.

The agencies anticipated that the first survey would at least help to increase awareness of the need for early intervention. Out of 155 districts which received the survey, 120 responded, with 75 indicating a positive interest in providing such services. The second survey was sent to these 75 districts, expecting that it would help them to clarify their thinking about types of programs appropriate to their preschool student populations. Six nationally validated programs meeting these districts' needs were invited to present their programs at the fall conference, along with five in-state model programs. Representatives of 52 districts participated in the conference, which was specifically designed to: 1) Give them in-depth program information about the participating model programs; and 2) Provide planning time to identify their specific programmatic and resource needs, using the program presenters as resources in this planning process.

As a result of the conference, at least five of the districts have made specific plans to begin programs for preschool handicapped children within their districts during the next year. Five to six others have developed two- or three-year plans to gradually develop such programs. The information made available to participants helped them to identify possible funding sources other than just local school funds, and several of the districts are planning to utilize these.

For more information, contact:

Christine Bartlett
SIG Director
Division of Special Education
Department of Educational and Cultural Services
State House Station #23
Augusta, ME 04333
207/289-3451

OHIO

The Ohio collaborative effort is unique in that the Early Childhood State Implementation Grant Project Director and the NDN State Facilitator operate under one administrative organization, the Ohio Department of Education; the SIG project is housed in the Division of Special Education; and the State Facilitator is located in the Division of Planning and Evaluation. Staff from both agencies were involved in planning and implementation activities.

Ohio State collaboration efforts began with an extensive planning process. This process, although time consuming, resulted in strategies that were well developed, administratively supported and which would meet the needs of both programs.

The planning phase consisted of three meetings. The goal of the first was to define the issues and areas of cooperation. This was accomplished by reviewing the national agreements and determining their impact on Ohio, describing the SIG/NDN programs at the state level and identifying areas in which collaboration was possible, and then defining problem areas which needed to be resolved.

The purpose of the second meeting was to become familiar with program organization and funding patterns and to resolve the various communication difficulties which were becoming evident. The third meeting provided project staff with goals and strategies for implementation during the coming year.

The goals of the OHIO SIG/NDN collaborative effort were to:

1. Increase awareness among special education programs, including early childhood programs, of the role and function of NDN.
2. Increase awareness among the NDN personnel of the unique needs of early childhood programs and special education.
3. Increase the number of LEA's adopting special education offerings.
4. Increase the number of NDN offerings in early childhood.

Three activities were implemented to carry out these goals. The NDN program was presented at the Comprehensive Personnel Development Meeting conducted by special education. SIG staff participated in the annual NDN awareness meeting and assisted in identifying specific programs to be offered, and NDN staff attended the annual statewide early childhood meeting which was designed to present validated programs.

As the implementation phase progressed, both the SIG and NDN staff found that benefits exceeded original expectations. There were three outstanding results. The level of technical assistance increased as staff became more knowledgeable of each other's programs. Confusion relating to outreach projects decreased (if questions occurred, a communication linkage was established to resolve problems); and special education adoptions by NDN increased dramatically.

At this time, school districts are being surveyed to determine which programs were adopted, especially for early childhood. The SIG staff is also surveying outreach projects participating in the annual statewide early childhood meeting to determine whether the meeting resulted in increased requests for service.

For the future, Ohio plans to continue collaborative efforts and to examine the potential for expansion within the state to include other educational programs and other state departments.

For more information, contact:

Veronica Payer
Division of Special Education
State Department of Education
933 High Street
Worthington, OH 43085
614/466-2650

WASHINGTON

In Washington, the SEA/SIG and the NDN State Facilitators have a formally structured cooperative relationship. The two agencies jointly review funding requests and make funding decisions, then cooperate in the monitoring and evaluation of JDRP funded programs. They also work together to determine needs and provide technical assistance.

In addition to these ongoing cooperative efforts, the SEA and NDN have cosponsored yearly awareness conferences promoting JDRP approved early childhood projects. The State Department of Public Instruction has contracted with the State Facilitators Project (supported with Title VI-B discretionary funds) to provide technical assistance and evaluation of elementary/secondary models and JDRP approved models which have been adopted by local school districts.

The State Education Agency employee responsible for the supervision of the early childhood education programs has also offered strategies for increasing cooperation between the SEA and HCEEP outreach projects. Sites and projects are encouraged to make use of Preschool Incentive Grants to fund JDRP approved models as adoptions and to participate on Special Education advisory councils, Early Childhood Task Forces and/or other early childhood consortia.

In 1979-80, 17 early childhood adoptions were funded through Preschool Incentive Grant monies, in addition to 16 Elementary/Secondary adoptions funded through Title VI-B discretionary funds. The following year, Preschool Incentive Grant funds supported 8 adoption grants to local school districts.

The future of the cooperative relationship is uncertain due to possible Title VI-B, Title IV-C and Preschool Incentive Grant funding reductions. However, it is anticipated that the promotion of JDRP approved early childhood models will continue through the support of Preschool Incentive Grant Funds. The following chart outlines the working relationship that has developed between Washington's SEA and the NDN.

For more information, contact:

Linda Espinosa
SIG Coordinator
OSPI
Special Services Section

Old Capitol Building
Olympia, WA 98504
206/753-0317

WASHINGTON COOPERATIVE MODEL

SPECIAL EDUCATION SEA/SIG	JOINT ACTIVITIES	NDN STATE FACILITATOR
Identify Needs		Feedback to SEA on identified needs
		Communicate SIG needs through state facilitator channels
		Follow-up with individual LEA's and other educators who have demonstrated interest
	Assist clients in selecting appropriate services through conferences, printed information, etc.	Respond to requests for services from SIG, i.e. awareness conferences, secondary awareness services (materials, workshops, visitations, etc.)
Announce availability of funds	Provide TA to clients applying for funds	
	Review funding requests	
Fund from available resources	Make funding decisions	
	Evaluation and monitoring of funded programs	

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Signed October 1, 1979

Cooperation/Coordination between the National Diffusion Network (NDN) of the Division of Educational Replication (DER) and the Division of Innovation and Development (DID) of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) Concerning JDRP Approved Projects.

Historical Perspective

The purposes of the NDN and the DID are closely related in the area of dissemination and stimulating utilization of exemplary practices in education. Until recently, there has been little relationship between the NDN and DID for two reasons: first, the DID had few projects which had obtained JDRP approval of their models which is required for NDN funding; second, NDN had few special education projects which had been submitted to JDRP from other sources such as Title IV-C. Now, however, DID has a total of 20 projects approved by JDRP and more special education projects are being considered for funding under the NDN. This change in status of projects provides for the development of cooperation and coordination between the NDN and the DID in order to facilitate the maximum impact of the dissemination effort of projects.

There have been several informal relationships between the NDN and the DID during the past year, particularly with respect to the HCEEP, as it currently has the greatest number of JDRP approved projects in DID. First, Drew Lebby and Bill Swan met several times to discuss NDN and DID in terms of similarities and differences. Second, Drew Lebby presented information on the NDN to a group of non-JDRP approved projects and the group of JDRP approved projects at the HCEEP Project Directors' Conference in November, 1978. Third, the HCEEP JDRP approved projects funded by NDN presented information to the NDN State Facilitators Meeting in San Antonio in February, 1979. Fourth, either five or six HCEEP/CSDC projects submitted responses to the Developer/Demonstrator RFP (NDN) for contracts to begin 10/1/79. Fifth, Bill Swan provided information to Lee Wickline for a speech on NDN and Special Education which was delivered in Dallas. Sixth, Betty Fogg (NDN) attended both the HCEEP Orientation Meeting for New Demonstration Projects and the Planning Meeting for the 1979

HCEEP Project Directors' Conference, both held in August. Seventh, Lee Wickline, Drew Lebby, Bill Swan, and Mary McMurrer met in September to examine ways in which NDN and DID might continue to cooperate and coordinate in maximizing the impact of projects in disseminating exemplary practices. And eighth, Jim Hamilton (DID) reviewed proposals in response to the NDN RFP.

The results of the informal working relationship have been productive to this time. A formalization of this relationship will probably enhance the impact of future efforts. The following statements are intended to be the basis for continued cooperation/coordination.

Formalization of Relationship

The goal of formalizing this relationship is to maximize the impact of JDRP approved projects which are disseminating their models of special education. The participants are the National Diffusion Network (Division of Educational Replication), the Developer/Demonstrators (D/Ds), the State Facilitators (SFs), the Division of Innovation and Development (Bureau of Education for the Handicapped), and the JDRP approved projects in the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program, the Handicapped Children's Model Program, the Severe/Profound Program, the Regional Education Program, and the Field Initiated Research Program.

There are four objectives for initiating this relationship relative to this goal:

1. To develop a working relationship to implement other objectives and to maintain continuing contact between the NDN (Drew Lebby, Sr. Program Officer, Outreach and Support Branch, DER) and DID (Bill Swan, Branch Chief, Program Development Branch, DID)

2. To exchange presentations at relevant meetings for the NDN and the DID on relevant topics such as JDRP, dissemination, replication, etc.

3. To develop pilot relationships between the State Facilitators and the D/Ds and State Implementation Grant Directors in five states to provide examples for effective cooperation/coordination at the State level consistent with the planned cooperation/coordination indicated by this memorandum of understanding.

4. To plan for the implementation of a subnetwork within the NDN focussing on special education D/Ds as soon as is reasonable.

The outputs for these objectives will be determined by Drew Lebby (DER) and Bill Swan (DID) as part of the development of the working relationship. A formal assessment of the effectiveness of this relation will be conducted in March, 1980 by the Division Directors of DER and DID relative to its continued efforts.

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS LIST

May, 1981 Conference

COLORADO

Peter Fanning
State Director of Special Education
Brian McNulty
Early Childhood Consultant
Colorado Department of Education
CHEEP
201 East Colfax
Denver, CO 80203
303/839-2727

ILLINOIS

Gloria Calavini
Manager for Program Development Section
Julie Carter
Early Childhood Consultant
Department of Specialized Educational Services
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777
217/782-6601

Nancy Farr
Illinois Systemwide Facilities Center
1105 East 5th
Metropolis, IL 62960
618/524-2664

MAINE

David Stockford
State Director of Special Education
Division of Special Education
Department of Education and Cultural Services
Augusta, ME 04333
207/289-3451

Christine Bartlett
SIG Director
Division of Special Education
Department of Educational and Cultural Servives
State House Station #23
Augusta, ME 04333
207/289-3451

NORTH CAROLINA

George Kahdy
Assistant State Superintendent for Instructional Services
Mable Hardison
SIG Coordinator
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC 27611
919/733-6081

OHIO

Veronica Payer
Division of Special Education
State Department of Education
933 High Street
Worthington, OH 43085
614/466-2650

WASHINGTON

Judy Schrag
Associate Superintendent of Special Education
OSPI
Special Services Section
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, WA 98504
206/753-0317

RESOURCE PEOPLE

Developer/Demonstrators

Trudy Schrandt
ERIN Outreach Program
376 Bridge Street
Dedham, MA
617/329-5529

Rebecca DuBose
A Model Preschool Center for Handicapped Children Outreach Project
Experimental Education Unit WJ-10
Child Development and Mental Retardation Center
Seattle, WA 98195
206/543-4011

NDN

Robert Mulligan
Deputy Director
National Diffusion Network
Room 802
1832 M. Street N.W.
Washington, DC
202/653-7000

TADS

Pat Trohanis
Mike Woodard
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
919/967-9221

WESTAR

Jerry Dominguez
Mike Norman
345 North Monmouth Avenue
Monmouth, OR 97361
503/838-1220, ext. 391

Bev Osteen
NASDSE
1201 16th Street N.W.
Suite 610E. NEA Building
Washington, DC 20036
202/833-4193

SES

Ed Sontag
Bill Swan
Gary Lambour
Jim Button
Ed Wilson
Dick Champion
Jane DeWeerd
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue
Donohoe Building, Room 3120
Washington, DC 20202
202/245-9722